

1 TRINETTE G. KENT (State Bar No. 222020)
2 10645 North Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-192
3 Phoenix, AZ 85028
4 Telephone: (480) 247-9644
5 Facsimile: (480) 717-4781
6 E-mail: tkent@leberglaw.com

7 Of Counsel to
8 Lemberg Law, LLC
9 A Connecticut Law Firm
10 1100 Summer Street
11 Stamford, CT 06905
12 Telephone: (203) 653-2250
13 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
15 Loretta George

16
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
19 EASTERN DIVISION
20

21 Loretta George,

22 Plaintiff,

23 vs.

24 Kohl's Department Stores, Inc.,

25 Defendant.

Case No.: 5:15-cv-1570

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

FOR VIOLATIONS OF:

- 1. THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT;**
- 2. THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff, Loretta George (hereafter “Plaintiff”), by undersigned counsel, brings
2 the following complaint against Kohl’s Department Stores, Inc. (hereafter
3 “Defendant”) and alleges as follows:
4

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 1. This action arises out of Defendant’s repeated violations of the
7 Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* (“TCPA”), and repeated
8 violations of the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788,
9 *et seq.* (“Rosenthal Act”).
10
11

12 2. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3), Cal. Civ.
13 Code 1788.30(f), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
14

15 3. Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), where
16 the acts and transactions giving rise to Plaintiff’s action occurred in this district and/or
17 where Defendant transacts business in this district.
18

19 **PARTIES**

20 4. Plaintiff is an adult individual residing in Lake Arrowhead, California,
21 and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code § 1788.2(g).
22

23 5. Plaintiff is a “debtor” as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(h).

24 6. Defendant is a business entity located in Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin,
25 and is a “person” as the term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39) and Cal Civ. Code §
26 1788.2(g).
27
28

1 7. Defendant, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of
2 itself or others, engages in the collection of consumer debts, and is a “debt collector”
3
4 as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(c).

5
6 **ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

7 8. Plaintiff is a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a debt asserted to
8 be owed to Defendant.

9
10 9. Plaintiff’s alleged obligation arises from a transaction in which property,
11 services or money was acquired on credit primarily for personal, family or household
12 purposes and is a “consumer debt” as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).

13
14 10. At all times mentioned herein where Defendant communicated with any
15 person via telephone, such communication was done via Defendant’s agent,
16 representative or employee.

17
18 11. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff utilized a cellular telephone
19 service and was assigned the following telephone number: 909-XXX-8446 (hereafter
20 “Number”).

21
22 12. Defendant placed calls to Plaintiff’s Number in an attempt to collect a
23 debt.

24
25 13. The aforementioned calls were placed using an automatic telephone
26 dialing system (“ATDS”).
27
28

14. When Plaintiff answered the phone, she was met with a significant period of silence followed by an automated click at which point the call was transferred to an operator or the call was disconnected.

15. Plaintiff does not know how Defendant acquired her cellular phone number as she did not provide it to Defendant, and Plaintiff never consented to be contacted at her Number.

16. On or around December 20, 2014, Plaintiff called Defendant and demanded that all calls to her cease.

17. Nevertheless, the calls continued at an excessive and harassing rate, averaging three to four calls per day over a three month period.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 47
U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.

19. The TCPA prohibits Defendant from using, other than for emergency purposes, an ATDS and/or Robocalls when calling Plaintiff's Number absent Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

20. Defendant's telephone system has the earmark of using an ATDS in that Plaintiff, upon answering calls from Defendant, heard silence followed by an automated click at which point the call was transferred to an operator.

21. Defendant called Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS without Plaintiff's consent in that Defendant either never had Plaintiff's prior express consent to do so or such consent was effectively revoked when Plaintiff requested that Defendant cease all further calls.

22. Defendant continued to willfully call Plaintiff's Number using an ATDS knowing that it lacked the requisite consent to do so in violation of the TCPA.

23. Plaintiff was harmed and suffered damages as a result of Defendant's actions.

24. The TCPA creates a private right of action against persons who violate the Act. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

25. As a result of each call made in violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages.

26. As a result of each call made knowingly and/or willingly in violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff may be entitled to an award of treble damages.

COUNT II

VIOLATIONS OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq.

27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this complaint as though fully stated herein.

28. The Rosenthal Act was passed to prohibit debt collectors from engaging in unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the collection of consumer debts.

29. Defendant caused Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously to annoy Plaintiff, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(d).

30. Defendant communicated with Plaintiff with such frequency as to be unreasonable, constituting harassment, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(e).

31. Plaintiff was harmed and is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

PRAAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant for:

A. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each call determined to be in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3);

B. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing under the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3);

C. Actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);

D. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for knowingly and willfully committing violations pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);

E. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c);

F. Punitive damages; and

G. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: August 5, 2015

TRINETTE G. KENT

By: /s/ Trinette G. Kent
Trinette G. Kent, Esq.
Lemberg Law, LLC
Attorney for Plaintiff, Loretta George